Remarks

In the present response, claims 1-29 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1 – 3, 5, 7, 15, and 17 – 29 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,615,251 (Klug) in view of USPN 6,941,338 (Madsen). These rejections are traversed.

Claims 1 – 3, 5, 7, 15, and 17 – 29 recite one or more elements that are not taught or suggested in Klug in view of Madsen. These missing elements show that the differences between the combined teachings in the art and the recitations in the claims are great. As such, the pending claims are not a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art. Some examples are provided below for the independent claims.

Claim 1

As one example, independent claim 1 recites web cache software that proactively caches, in a local memory of the access point, non-requested web pages that relate to a topic of a web page requested by a guest and indicates to the guest that the non-requested web pages are available for viewing. Klug in view of Madsen does not teach this claim element.

Klug teaches users connecting to websites with browsers on a computer. The examiner admits that "Klug does not teach explicitly web pages cached in local memory of the access point" (see OA mailed 05/01/2009 at p. 4). Applicants agree with this admission.

Madsen teaches base stations that provide wireless access to and from remote users (see col. 3, lines 8-11). The base stations include a cache 116 that "is used to store information frequently requested by the users associated with the corresponding base station …. In one embodiment, the cache 116 stores frequently requested HTML files and objects" (see col. 4, lines 26-34: portions omitted). Thus, Madsen expressly teaches storing web pages already requested by the user.

The combination of Klug in view of Madsen fails to teach or even suggest web cache software that proactively caches non-requested web pages that relate to a topic of a

web page requested by a guest and indicates to the guest that the non-requested web pages are available for viewing. The combination of Klug in view of Madsen teaches storing web pages already requested by a user.

As another example, claim 1 recites a usage collector application that monitors and collects usage of all of said guests. The examiner argues that "Klug teaches the claimed, a usage collector application that monitors usage of all of said guests (Fig. 3, col. 10, lines 25-28)" (see OA mailed 05/01/2009 at p. 4). This section, however, does not teach a usage collector that collects usage as claimed.

Claim 12

As one example, independent claim 12 recites predicting non-requested web pages that relate to a topic of a web page requested by the guest and that are of interest for the guest based on the guest's usage patterns. Klug in view of Madsen does not teach this claim element.

Klug teaches users connecting to websites with browsers on a computer. The examiner admits that "Klug does not explicitly teach predicting information of interest for the guest" (see OA mailed 05/01/2009 at pages 6-7). Applicants agree with this admission.

Madsen teaches base stations that provide wireless access to and from remote users (see col. 3, lines 8-11). The base stations include a cache 116 that "is used to store information frequently requested by the users associated with the corresponding base station .... In one embodiment, the cache 116 stores frequently requested HTML files and objects" (see col. 4, lines 26-34: portions omitted). Thus, Madsen expressly teaches storing web pages already requested by the user.

The combination of Klug in view of Madsen fails to teach or even suggest predicting non-requested web pages that relate to a topic of a web page requested by the guest and that are of interest for the guest based on the guest's usage patterns. The combination of Klug in view of Madsen teaches storing web pages already requested by a user.

Claim 17

As one example, independent claim 17 recites access points that cache in local memory non-requested web pages that relate to topics of previously requested web pages by the guests..., the non-requested pages being a prediction based on usage patterns of the guests. Klug in view of Madsen does not teach this claim element.

Klug teaches users connecting to websites with browsers on a computer. The examiner admits that "Klug does not teach explicitly analyze guest usage" (see OA mailed 05/01/2009 at p. 9). Applicants agree with this admission.

Madsen teaches base stations that provide wireless access to and from remote users (see col. 3, lines 8-11). The base stations include a cache 116 that "is used to store information frequently requested by the users associated with the corresponding base station .... In one embodiment, the cache 116 stores frequently requested HTML files and objects" (see col. 4, lines 26-34: portions omitted). Thus, Madsen expressly teaches storing web pages already requested by the user.

The combination of Klug in view of Madsen fails to teach or even suggest access points that cache in local memory non-requested web pages that relate to topics of previously requested web pages by the guests..., the non-requested pages being a prediction based on usage patterns of the guests. The combination of Klug in view of Madsen teaches storing web pages already requested by a user.

As another example, claim 17 recites a usage collector application detecting and collecting information relating to guest usage. Klug does not teach a usage collector that both detects and collects usage information.

Claim 25

As one example, independent claim 25 recites the access point predicts and caches in local memory a non-requested web page that relates to a topic previously requested by a guest. Klug in view of Madsen does not teach this claim element.

Klug teaches users connecting to websites with browsers on a computer. The examiner admits that "Klug does not explicitly teach storing contents in access point local memory" (see OA mailed 05/01/2009 at p. 11). Applicants agree with this admission.

Madsen teaches base stations that provide wireless access to and from remote users (see col. 3, lines 8-11). The base stations include a cache 116 that "is used to store information frequently requested by the users associated with the corresponding base station …. In one embodiment, the cache 116 stores frequently requested HTML files and objects" (see col. 4, lines 26-34: portions omitted). Thus, Madsen expressly teaches storing web pages already requested by the user.

The combination of Klug in view of Madsen fails to teach or even suggest the access point predicts and caches in local memory a non-requested web page that relates to a topic previously requested by a guest. The combination of Klug in view of Madsen teaches storing web pages already requested by a user.

As another example, claim 25 means in said access point for monitoring and collecting requests made by a guest to collect information on a guest's usage pattern. Klug in view of Madsen does not teach such means.

The differences between the claims and the teachings in the art are great since the references fail to teach or suggest all of the claim elements. As such, the pending claims are not a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art.

For at least these reasons, the claims are allowable over the art of record.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 4, 6, and 16 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,615,251 (Klug) in view of USPN 6,941,338 (Madsen) and USPN 6,963,874 (Kasriel). These rejections are traversed.

As explained above, Klug in view of Madsen fails to teach or suggest all elements of independent claims 1 and 12. Kasriel fails to cure these deficiencies. For at least the reasons given for independent claims 1 and 12, respective dependent claims 4, 6, and 16 are allowable over Klug in view of Madsen and Kasriel.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. 832-236-5529. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip S. Lyren #40,709/

Philip S. Lyren
Reg. No. 40,709
Ph: 832-236-5529